Judge person, not sexuality

G.T. 3-27-91

Lately the Gazette Telegraph editorial pages have become a forum for diatribes against homosexuals. People are implying that somehow it was not as heinous that Hitler sent homosexuals to death camps as it was for other citizens. It has been stated that AIDS is a homosexual's just desserts.

Syndicated columnist Patrick Buchanan prefers to use the epithet "sodomites" (seven times) and blames them for "disintegration of the traditional family," including the high rate of divorce.

I personally have not known many homosexuals, but I feel I have known enough to say that they are as diverse a group of people as heterosexuals. Doubtless, there are some homosexuals (and heterosexuals!) who I wouldn't want as my son's Boy Scout leader. But, on the other hand, one of my favorite high school teachers, an English teacher who made literature and even grammar come alive, was a homosexual.

I agree that "the family" is in trouble in our society. But I venture that homosexuals have nothing to do with teen-age pregnancy, the heterosexual divorce rate and latchkey children.

If a person deplores homosexuality and believes it to be a sin, fine, let him teach those values to his children. I feel, however, that any person deserves to be judged on the whole of their character and not solely their sexual preference.

— **Lenore Fleck**
Black Forest

Human rights vs. special privileges

G.T. 4-16-91

The recent pro-homosexual rights letters to the Gazette Telegraph consistently promote at least two distorted ideas: The first is that, rather than pushing some hidden agenda, the homosexual lobby is striving to make this a more loving, open and tolerant world for all people. The second false idea is that all who question the need for more homosexual privileges are bigots, pure and simple.

For example, in Robin Miller's response to the GT's editorial of March 29, she predictably invokes the high ideals of freedom and justice, while denying that homosexuals are seeking preferential treatment. Notably absent, however, is her reply to the Gazette's mention of the Wisconsin case in which two women who declined to accept a lesbian roommate were fined $1,500 and subjected to mandatory "training" by a homosexual organization. (Note that this case involved not landlord and renter, but roommates sharing the same apart-

In her own open-minded way, Miller refers to all those not aligned with her point of view as bigots in the mold of Adolf Hitler.

Despite the homosexual lobby's denials, they have won special treatment, often at the expense of others' rights. While health or life insurance companies may ask just about any pertinent personal question in setting clients' rates, they may not ask about sexual orientation. Thus, homosexual males living an extremely dangerous "lifestyle" pay rates subsidized by, but without the consent of, the majority.

AIDS is treated differently than any other deadly communicable disease, thanks to gay lobbying. Their more loving, tolerant and open-minded approach prevents health care workers from knowing which patients put them at risk of infection by the dread ailment. Further, AIDS funding is disproportionately higher than that of other, less preventable, diseases with higher death tolls.

Georgetown University, founded on Christian ideals which strictly forbid homosexual activity, was forced to fund homosexual organizations on campus. This was accomplished in violation of the very first line of the First Amendment. Is it bigotry to question the fairness of these and other such situations?

Rather than exemplifying fairness, homosexual activists have often been models of the intolerance they claim to loathe. They have desecrated churches, disrupted Sunday services and thrown condoms at Catholic priests. This because the church refuses to condone homosexual activity, and despite the fact that the church has been at the forefront of caring for AIDS victims. Thus, while the Catholic and other Christian churches have been faithful to their ideals of hating the sin, but loving the sinner, they have been attacked for refusing to bless what has proven itself to be not a lifestyle, but rather a "deathstyle."

Militant gays have also threatened to expose the secret lifestyles of prominent homosexuals, without regard for these people's rights.

There are human rights and then there are special privileges. There is honest difference of opinion and then there is blind intolerance. May each of us recognize which is which.

— **Bill Leonard**
Colorado Springs